

Appendix E Course of Action Analysis Executive Summary

E-1. Scope

This document presents the results of a comprehensive analysis of potential courses of action (COAs) for implementing the Army's Integrated Sustainment Maintenance (ISM) initiative. It includes specific recommendations for consideration by the Army leadership for ISM implementation.

E-2. Introduction

a. Sustainment maintenance refers to all maintenance conducted on Army equipment above the direct support level. Because of the varied composition of units and activities performing sustainment maintenance, no single organization is currently responsible for the Army's sustainment maintenance program. The disadvantages of this structure became apparent during the Gulf War when numerous obstacles were encountered in deploying and implementing the theater sustainment maintenance system.

b. The goal of the ISM initiative is to optimize the Total Army sustainment maintenance capability to support the full spectrum of Army missions. Under ISM, the Army is moving to implement a streamlined structure featuring:

- (1) Centralized management of resources and work-loading.
- (2) Decentralized execution of Total Army sustainment maintenance requirements.
- (3) Maintenance management accomplished through an automated information system which fully integrates management at the:
 - (a) National Sustainment Maintenance Management (NSMM) level.
 - (b) Regional Sustainment Maintenance Management (RSMM) level.
 - (c) Local Sustainment Maintenance Management (LSMM) level.

E-3. Methodology Overview

a. Numerous alternatives for implementing ISM were identified during the course of the nine-month ISM Proof of Principle, the Expanded ISM Demonstration, and the implementation of Corps Managed Regional Repair Programs. Input from the Army Staff, the major Army commands (MACOMs), the Army Materiel Command (AMC), Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs), and other staffs and agencies were used to define the potential implementation alternatives to produce the optimal COAs for consideration. Eventually, six COAs were evaluated using three different analytical methods.

b. The first of these methods expanded TRADOC's standard Doctrine, Training, Leader Development, Organizations, Materiel, and Soldiers (DTLOMS) assessment framework to include the additional categories of civilian employees, Army policy, and resource impacts. Each COA was assessed against this DTLOMS-expanded (DTLOMS-X) framework. The second analytical method focused on the relative advantages and disadvantages of each COA. The third method used 36 criteria to examine the degree to which each COA would potentially address the concerns of the three groups primarily affected by ISM: Warfighters, Logisticians, and Budget Managers.

c. During an ISM Inter-MACOM Work Group meeting, conducted from 19 through 21 September 1995, the six COAs were evaluated and scored according to the criteria described above. The Work Group also agreed on an overall resourcing strategy for the COAs.

E-4. Discussion

The two most distinctive features distinguishing the COAs are the extent of centralization of management functions and the degree to which they would alter the current command and control structure of sustainment maintenance assets.

Appendix E Course of Action Analysis Executive Summary

a. Base Course of Action: The Base COA, a derivative of the original ISM concept, calls for a full-up ISM organization under AMC. AMC would establish, staff, and operate sustainment maintenance offices at the national, regional, and local levels. Under the Base COA, the Army would reassign all Active Component sustainment maintenance organizations/elements (Directorate of Logistics, General Support Maintenance Units, contractors, etc.) to AMC. AMC would also workload Reserve Component sustainment maintenance units in peacetime and, upon mobilization, would exercise command and control of such units during deployment.

b. COA I - COA I would modify the Base COA sustainment maintenance structure by reducing the role of AMC and preserving the current relationship between MACOMs and their sustainment maintenance organizations. In COA I, AMC would establish, staff, and operate the NSMM and the RSMM offices. MACOMs would establish, staff, and operate the LSMM offices.

c. COA II - Under COA II, AMC would be responsible for establishing and operating the NSMM office. The MACOMs would establish and operate RSMMs and LSMMs.

d. COA III - Under this alternative, AMC's existing National Inventory Control Points would perform the NSMM functions. As with COA II, the MACOMs would establish and operate the RSMMs and LSMMs.

e. COA IV - COA IV proposed a limited management structure in which AMC's NSMM functions and staffing would be minimized and concentrated on customer assistance functions. As with COAs II and III, MACOMs would establish, staff, and operate the TSMMs/RSMMs and the LSMMs.

f. COA V - COA V would exclude all NSMM missions, functions, and structure. The MACOMs would establish and operate RSMMs and LSMMs. Ownership of sustainment maintenance assets would not change. COA V resembles FORSCOM's Corps-Managed Regional Repair Programs currently operational in III Corps and XVIII Airborne Corps.

E-5. Conclusions and Recommendations

a. Scoring of the six COAs by the ISM Inter-MACOM Work Group is illustrated in Figure E-1.

<u>Base COA</u>	<i>1,505 points</i>
<u>COA I</u>	<i>1,525 points</i>
<u>COA II</u>	<i>1,435 points</i>
<u>COA III</u>	<i>1,120 points</i>
<u>COA IV</u>	<i>1,260 points</i>
<u>COA V</u>	<i>889 points</i>

Figure E-1

b. While the Base COA elicited broad support and received the second highest score, the ISM Inter-MACOM Work Group concluded that the current lack of a single stock fund/ centralized asset management policy and the significant potential impact on Army organizational structure make the Base COA non-executable as a near-term option.

c. Consensus was reached to continue further development and staffing of both COA I and II. Based on the consensus of final input from MACOMs and other agencies, either COA I or COA II will be recommended to the Army leadership as the optimal solution for implementing ISM.